

Gender Equity in Pay Task Force
Meeting 1 – August 16, 2013

Present

Co-chairs - Patricia Hayden and Julie Nelson

Taskforce members - Sutapa Basu, Louise Chernin, Janet Chung, Councilmember Jean Godden, Mitchell Hunter, Paul Killpatrick, Lynn Lindsay, Bridgette Maryman, Guadalupe Perez, Barbara Reskin, Bernardo Ruiz, Kia Sanger, Julia Sterkovsky, Liz Vivian, Marilyn Watkins

Guests - Karina Bull, Monica Ghosh, David Stewart, Christa Valles

Absent

Lulu Carpenter

1. Welcome and introductions

Julie welcomed Task Force members to the meeting and voiced her appreciation for their participation. Task Force members introduced themselves and shared the reason that they are interested in gender equity in pay.

Julie shared that her and Patricia will alternate chairing each meeting. Patricia will freely interject in anything that Julie does and vice versa.

2. Review of charge to Task Force and draft work plan

✓ **Identify any revisions to draft work plan**

Julie walked people through the attached powerpoint and asked for any questions or suggestions on the work plan. Suggestions were as follows:

- Jean suggested a study of provision of childcare and how it can be tied to zoning. She has been working with the Human Services Department on childcare. For example, developers can decide to offer childcare in their building and in exchange they will get additional floor space. A study would be a good thing; it would not be a large amount of money and could be included in this year's budget for Council.
- Marilyn suggested that contracting can be used as a tool to achieve equity.
- Louise suggested that the City use LGBT certification as part of the WMBE requirements. California is doing this now and it is an idea to expand contracting requirements.
- Patricia suggested that a staff person is needed for policy analysis with the Task Force and to launch the Gender and Social Justice Initiative.
- Julie commended Task Force members for their early ideas on strategies and suggested that the group should focus on reviewing the proposed work plan, she noted there was time later on the agenda to begin discussion of strategies.
- Mitch asked whether the running list of potential strategies is something that all can contribute to, and Julie indicated that it is.

- Janet asked whether there would be an opportunity for public input in this task force process. Bridgette shared information about the Women's Commission's Equal Pay Forum Monday evening (scheduled prior to the convening of the Task Force as a part of the Women's Commission work plan). This event is one example of involving the public. Other Task Force members indicated a willingness to engage with their constituents so that we have strong inclusion. Janet suggested that we could also collect input via a website and electronically. Jean shared that after her Seattle Times op-ed, she heard from some constituents that they did not believe there were real issues, so she established a web site to begin to collect personal stories about the wage gap. Louise asked whether the Equal Pay Forum will be filmed by Seattle Channel, and Bridgette shared that it will be.

3. Review and discussion of City report on gender equity in pay

✓ Identify any additional wage data analysis needed

David Stewart, City Personnel Director, walked people through the attached powerpoint. Questions and suggestions for additional wage data analysis were as follows:

- Lynn indicated an interest in learning whether the library has the same kind of variation in pay. David shared that the Library was left out because their pay is determined by a different set of rules.
- Lynn asked for further analysis of categories of jobs that are predominately held by men, such as in SPD.
- Barbara shared that she has also done some preliminary analysis of the data set. She looked at a few departments:
 - At Seattle Center there are lots of jobs that only have males or only have females. If the male jobs pay more than the female jobs, then the pay disparity is noticeable. The measure that she uses is commonly used for school segregation. To see how much jobs are segregated, you can calculate the percentage of workers who would need to change a job to get the jobs balanced. For Seattle Center, 2/3 of the workers would have to change jobs for the distributions to be the same. This is an extraordinarily high level of segregation.
 - At City Light, two thirds of the classifications are only male or female. You would have to move 50% of the workers to end job segregation.

She also looked at some occupations that are commonly held across numerous departments. The Information Technology professionals are distributed across 14 departments. A fifth of them would have to move to a different department to be equally distributed across the departments.

She found extreme concentrations of men and women in different jobs. She noted that historically, people have said that women don't want the jobs held by men. For example, employers assumed that women did not want managerial jobs, but a study was conducted that looked at job conditions, such as job start-times, etc. The results were almost the same for men and women in desire for upward mobility and barriers. Men also wanted to leave early to bring their kids to soccer practice.

- Julia suggested analysis of positions that are predominately male or female and the wages and

which departments are predominately male or female and the wages. She asked the question, “Why are the positions held by women valued less? Why are childcare workers paid less than parking attendants?” We don’t want to just say that women have to get predominately male jobs to be paid well.

- Barbara shared that studies show that the higher percentage of women in a job, the higher the wage penalty for men and women.
- Bridgette noted that it is also important to think about retention. Certain fields are not welcoming to one gender or another. What are the data points to show this? Is SPD not doing enough to recruit women? David shared that the ability to draw conclusions from retention data is challenging. We can tell you how many women are in SPD, but we can’t tell you the reason that they left the job. Julie asked for analysis by job classification of the average length of employment based on gender and race.
- Bernardo noted that reports on pay equity from around the world focus on starting salary and suggested that we look at the number of women appointed to senior level position at what salaries and what kinds of mentoring are we providing to women to take on those roles.
- Lynn asked whether examining private versus public sector wages by job classification would provide useful information.
- Guadelupe described the union’s involvement in the issue of negotiating wages. The last time that we discussed wages for classifications was the negotiated process in 2007. The City addressed every title that the union thought needed addressing, including changes in work conditions. There were “buckets” of titles that were analyzed for the need for adjustments. The easiest way to get that information was to compare wages in other jurisdictions. For example, compare accountant at City Light versus accountant in San Francisco or Portland. There was no analysis for gender or race; it was merely the wage. No wages have been adjusted for four years because we just got out of a budget crisis when we are faced with layoffs. Currently, the City is under-market for wages.
- Janet noted that the entry point for salary is definitely a concern. Women are less likely to negotiate a higher wage and have less leverage for negotiation from former jobs. She asked whether there is exit data for people leaving City jobs. David shared that the data on applicant numbers is limited to the past three years, and that the City has just started minimal exit data collection.
- Janet suggested that the lack of paid parental leave could have huge impact for retention and hiring.
- Mitch asked if we can look at histories of bullying (race, gender, LGBT) in departments? For example, can we look at employee complaints and determine if the complaint is the reason for leaving. Guadelupe shared that the unions are on the ground floor and see complaints about hostile work environment based on gender and race. This is happening at City Light. HR at City Light conducts the investigation and it goes nowhere, indicating that the information is “not enough.” David indicated that complaint data is available, but we can’t necessarily make correlations to leaving with the data. Also, there are limits to sharing information for legal reasons, such as separation agreements.
- Julia suggested analysis of complaints about hostile work environment – Who are the departing employees? Are the departing employees predominately women?

- Sutapa asked about the information in the exit interviews. David shared that there is an on-line and written survey that is voluntary. If there is information suggesting the need for follow-up, the department is contacted.
- Marilyn noted that in one of the appendices, there is information on age. Research has shown that men's wages ascend until middle age, but women's wages only go up a tiny bit at a time. For data, it would be interesting to analyze life cycles and wages by gender, aside from just job classifications. She asked if there are policies that the City has to encourage women to stay in jobs, promoting of upward mobility, and women actually moving up in responsibility and pay categories without sacrificing time with families.
- Liz asked for data to be analyzed over time so that we can look at trends. Are we on a trend to getting closer to 50/50 or not? She also asked that we analyze the impact of parenthood and race on wages among women? David shared that the City does not collect parenthood information from employees and doing so would likely be problematic for legal reasons. Louise asked if the information could be collected anonymously, but it was noted that would not allow us to connect parental status with wages. Guadelupe suggested that the unions might support the data collection if it allowed a greater ability to conduct this type of analysis.
- Bernardo suggested that we examine disciplinary actions by gender and race.
- Lynn asked about analysis of people moving from one level to another, and indicated that training to support upward mobility used to be standard. She asked about initiatives the City has to encourage women to be trained? This kind of training could help people move from predominately female jobs to other jobs.
- Guadelupe shared that with out of class opportunities, the policy is that the opportunities rotate, but it is more likely that the same people get the opportunities and it helps their resume. Some managers have so much faith in an employee that the employee is given extra job duties that lead to re-classification. Are men given more of the extra job duties? Julie suggested that it would be helpful to have an overview of City HR policies, such as out-of-class assignments and job re-classifications.
- Patricia asked that we look at the number of female department directors and their longevity in their positions.
- Krista suggested that it would be helpful to think about strategies for parental leave (e.g. sick leave donations).

Summary of data requested:

1. Analysis of Library data
2. Job segregation
 - a. Analysis of job categories that are primarily held by men / women with the wages
 - b. Analysis of departments that are disproportionately male
3. Leadership – number of women in senior level positions, at the City-wide level and by department, with salary information
4. Retention – average length of time in position by gender, exit data for people leaving City employment
5. Work environment – employee complaints (grievances and discrimination complaints), by department, including gender and race. Number of disciplinary actions by department, race

and gender.

6. Upward mobility – who moves up over time by gender and race? Who receives upward mobility opportunities by gender and race?
7. Life cycle analysis – is there a “normal” trajectory for City employment that differs between genders, including starting wages, upward mobility, and length of time as an employee?
8. Historical data – how has the number of women / men changed over the decades? How has the pay gap shifted over the decades?

4. Discuss potential strategies to address gender equity in pay gaps

- ✓ **Identify strategies to research before next meeting**
- ✓ **Task force members or staff agree to research potential strategies and bring description, pros, cons and cost of implementation to the September meeting**

Julie opened this discussion by noting that she had initiated a list of potential strategies that she had collected from Task Force members. Discussion ensued as follows:

- Veteran’s preference for positions in SPD – Julie shared that Anne Levinson, the Director of the Office for Professional Accountability Review Board had noted the disparate impact of this policy in SPD hiring processes. Anne also shared that there are other jurisdictions who would likely be interested in working on this issue. Julie shared that this is a great example of unintentional institutional sexism because the preference is available for men and women, but there is a negative impact on women.
- Paycheck Fairness Ordinance – Jean noted that the proposed law is stuck at the federal level, but we might have success with passing legislation at the local level. Preventing retaliation for asking about wages seems pretty basic since it is helpful for people to know how much others are paid. Discussion took place about the accessibility of this information currently. Marilyn noted that we don’t want to force people to look up the workers in each job category, it should be accessible to comparable positions. For example, administrative assistants versus parking garage attendants (disparate wages, but equivalent positions). Julie shared that SOCR has had preliminary conversations with the Law Department about a Paycheck Fairness Ordinance at the local level.
- Louise shared frustration that we have had the equal pay discussion for decades, and talked about the similarities of discussions across the decades. She indicated a desire for this discussion to result in more meaningful changes that are sustainable. Julie suggested that our work can have greater leverage if we focus on opportunities to address systemic issues. Patricia added that we don’t need programs, we need systemic and structural change.
- Job Analysis Study – Julia suggested funding for a “job analysis study” that gets to the content of the job and the skills required for positions and assigns a point that is equivalent to a dollar amount that results in a market rate adjustment for each job. Barbara shared that the state of Oregon did this 25 years ago, as did Ontario and New Zealand.
- Create Targeted Workforce Development Training and Apprenticeship Programs – Guadelupe

shared that there are goals in the City, but there is not a system or procedure to define how that happens. Dave shared that the City has not ever had a focus on succession planning. The idea for succession planning is to train workers (men and women) for greater responsibility. He shared that he is proposing the idea of “one city; one employer” with central leadership on this issue.

- Public Trainings – Mitch suggested that it would be helpful to have trainings on the City’s employment application process as it is not very user friendly. He noted that if people do not have experience filling out the applications, they are not going to go far in the system.
- Liz suggested that it would be good to define the problem before strategizing solutions. For example, is it really a problem that more men are in City jobs than women? Is there a leadership gap? She suggested three main categories: differences in the numbers of employees by gender, job segregation, and the leadership gap. Marilyn added that it would be good to focus on opportunities to drive systemic change using the City as a model.
- Parental Leave Pay – Jean suggested that this is the largest stumbling block for women. It is a bad system for the City to have employees using unpaid leave or unused vacation/sick leave. Discussion took place relating to best practices in the private sector and the availability of such information. Barbara agreed that this should be a high priority. It would not be a difficult to develop a model to predict the number of employees needing paid parental leave and to project the costs. David noted that the average age of new City employee is 47, the average age of a current City employee is 48, and the average age in SPD is in the 30’s. Janet suggested that we shouldn’t just look at the financial costs, studies have shown financial benefits due to increased retention with parental leave.

Next steps:

Three sub-committees were formed that will meet between now and our next meeting to develop more specific thinking in the following three areas:

1. Family Friendly policies – Marilyn will convene Bridgette, Liz, Kia, and Karina
2. Job Analysis Scoring – Janet will convene Barbara, Lynn and Julia
3. Women in Leadership – Liz will convene Sutapa, Louise, Bernardo, Mitch and Paul

Mitch suggested that we also need to look at City policies, which are likely to cut across all topics. We will assess the need for a group on that topic next time.

5. Logistics for future meetings

✓ Decide meeting location for the remainder of the year

Patricia will host future meetings at the East Cherry YWCA (28th and Cherry) where parking is less of a challenge. Julie will be sharing the meeting schedule via e-mail. It, unfortunately appears as if there is not a time that will work for all members, so she will do her best to make it work for the most people.